



JOHN W. SWINDELLS, PUBLISHER.

DALLAS, DALLAS COUNTY, TEXAS, JULY 14, 1866.

VOL. XIII, NO. 43.—WHOLE NUMBER, 668.

NOTICE!

From the New Orleans Crescent.
IN MEMORIAM
Of Ex-Governor Henry W. Allen of La.
BY MRS. M. B. HAY.

A requiem of the dead! What shall it be,
The soft, low moaning wrung from suffering heart?
A sad sweet melody, murmuring melody,
Whose tender cadence makes the tears drop fast?

What requiem worthy shall in music rise,
Whose waves shall fill in swelling symphonies,
To fill through time the over-arching skies,
And wake his country's heart and dew her eyes?

With tears for Truth, upon her altars slain,
And crowned Virtue dying far from Freedom's chosen plain?

As Niebe's shall be thy country's tongue—
O'er her slain sons and heroes' chariot crushed
Her lyre upon the willows rest unstrung,
Her pallid cheek be with thy name not flushed

With burning glory and with conscious conscious pride
That thou of her was't born, and, for her, exiled, died!

If blood-bathed Hector, thrice dragged,
Lifted, crushed—
Andromache, bedewed with briny tear—
If from a goddess mother's eyes have gushed
A bitter fount o'er brave Achilles' bier—
What shall we pour upon thy funeral pyre?
A patriot martyr, dying like our saviors
Blackened fire.

The hero, who successful, palm-crowned,
Lifted, crushed—
In honor's gorgeous high uplifted seat—
"Te laudamus" forever beareth—what be-
lieve

The hero, thorn-crowned, spear-pierced,
Lie complete
In all true greatness—strong to love, to bear,
To lay down life, fame, fortune in his country's
fate to share?

What urn, befitting such Electra send,
To hold Orestes, thy cold, voiceless clay?
What pall above, as sorrow's banner, lead
Its solemn folds to hide the glare of day?
Thy urn, thy country's heart, her flag thy
gall!

Whose bleeding folds are baptized now in
suffering's wine and gall.

Oh, Southern heart! that, widowed, waits
sore,
With pallid brow the flush of rosette
dawn.

To break thy night of sorrow, sing the psalm,
That martyrs suffering wake, for thou
hast borne

The sons of glory, whose immortal fame,
As Troy's stern bleeding heroes, deathless
make thy name!
NEW ORLEANS, June 7, 1866.

MR. DAVIS NOT TO BE ADMITTED
TO BAIL.—The Washington correspond-
ent of the St. Louis Republic,
telegraphed on the 12th as follows:

It is intimated that it was fully
decided in Cabinet to-day that Jeff-
erson Davis should neither be bail-
ed nor paroled. This is supposed
to end the matter.

Another dispatch of the same date
says:

The following is Judge Under-
wood's decision in full, as laid be-
fore the President, on the applica-
tion of counsel for the release of
Jeff. Davis on bail. It contains
some points not published.

Judge Underwood said: "I have
considered the application made by
Mr. Shea (counsel) to admit Jeff.
Davis to bail. Under the circum-
stances the application might have
been more properly made to me
when recently holding the Circuit
Court at Richmond. But under the
law it may, doubtless, be made also
in vacation, and I will briefly state
my views of it and my conclusions.

In the States which were in active
rebellion military jurisdiction is still
exercised and martial law enforced.
The civil authorities—State and
Federal—have been required or per-
mitted to resume partially their re-
spective functions, but the Presi-
dent, as the Commander-in-Chief,
still controls their action so far as
he thinks such control is necessary
to pacification and restoration. In
holding the District and Circuit
Courts of Virginia, I have uniform-
ly recognized this condition. Jeff-
erson Davis was arrested under a
proclamation of the President, charg-
ing him with complicity in the as-
sassination of the late President
Lincoln. He has been held ever
since, and is now held, as a military
prisoner. He is not and never has
been in the custody of the Marshal
for the District of Virginia, and he
is not therefore in the power of the
Court. While this condition re-
mains no proposition for bail can be
properly entertained, and I do not
wish to indicate any probable action
under the circumstances."

Among the most prominent of the
rising young poets of the South is
Miss Mollie E. Moore, of Texas,
who is now in our city en route for
a pleasure trip to the North, with the
family of E. H. Cushing, the late
proprietor of the Houston Telegraph.
Miss Moore's effusions attracted
general commendation as they ap-
peared in the columns of the Tele-
graph during the last five years—
Her genius is undoubted; her com-
mand of language remarkable; and
her excellence, at her early age,
promises lines that will be enduring
when a few more years of study,
thought and feeling shall have set
their seal upon her brain and heart.
We learn with pleasure that her
poems will soon be published.—New
Orleans Times.

At a printer's festival lately, the
following toast was offered: "Wom-
an—second only to the press in the
dissemination of news!"

Consents are now being made of
leather. This is doubtless in obedi-
ence to the poet's request:
"O Muse, of hideous hide of skins!"

All the local elections in southern
Illinois show Democratic gains of
from fifty to one hundred per cent.
over the last vote.

John Rots, the Cherokee chieftain
thirty years, is dead. He was old,
and, if we remember, was a gradu-
ate of Dartmouth. Two or three
of his sons and daughters were edu-
cated in New England, and were
likely people.

John Rots, the Cherokee chieftain
thirty years, is dead. He was old,
and, if we remember, was a gradu-
ate of Dartmouth. Two or three
of his sons and daughters were edu-
cated in New England, and were
likely people.

John Rots, the Cherokee chieftain
thirty years, is dead. He was old,
and, if we remember, was a gradu-
ate of Dartmouth. Two or three
of his sons and daughters were edu-
cated in New England, and were
likely people.

John Rots, the Cherokee chieftain
thirty years, is dead. He was old,
and, if we remember, was a gradu-
ate of Dartmouth. Two or three
of his sons and daughters were edu-
cated in New England, and were
likely people.

John Rots, the Cherokee chieftain
thirty years, is dead. He was old,
and, if we remember, was a gradu-
ate of Dartmouth. Two or three
of his sons and daughters were edu-
cated in New England, and were
likely people.

John Rots, the Cherokee chieftain
thirty years, is dead. He was old,
and, if we remember, was a gradu-
ate of Dartmouth. Two or three
of his sons and daughters were edu-
cated in New England, and were
likely people.

John Rots, the Cherokee chieftain
thirty years, is dead. He was old,
and, if we remember, was a gradu-
ate of Dartmouth. Two or three
of his sons and daughters were edu-
cated in New England, and were
likely people.

John Rots, the Cherokee chieftain
thirty years, is dead. He was old,
and, if we remember, was a gradu-
ate of Dartmouth. Two or three
of his sons and daughters were edu-
cated in New England, and were
likely people.

John Rots, the Cherokee chieftain
thirty years, is dead. He was old,
and, if we remember, was a gradu-
ate of Dartmouth. Two or three
of his sons and daughters were edu-
cated in New England, and were
likely people.

John Rots, the Cherokee chieftain
thirty years, is dead. He was old,
and, if we remember, was a gradu-
ate of Dartmouth. Two or three
of his sons and daughters were edu-
cated in New England, and were
likely people.

John Rots, the Cherokee chieftain
thirty years, is dead. He was old,
and, if we remember, was a gradu-
ate of Dartmouth. Two or three
of his sons and daughters were edu-
cated in New England, and were
likely people.

The Report of the minority of
the Reconstruction Committee, con-
sisting of Senator Reverdy Johnson,
of Maryland, and Representatives
Grier of Kentucky and Rogers of
New Jersey, argues that "a State,
as such, cannot commit, or be in-
dicted for a crime," and that "no le-
gal proceeding, civil or criminal,
can be instituted to deprive a State
of the benefits of the Constitution,
by forfeiting as against her any of
the rights secured to her." They
appeal to the submission of the con-
stitutional amendment to those
States as a proof that they are in
the Union; such a submission "has
no warrant or foundation except on
the hypothesis that they are as ab-
solutely States of the Union as any
of the other States." It is also
maintained that the power to sup-
press insurrection does not confer
the right "to subjugate the State
within whose limits the insurrection
may prevail, and to extinguish it as
a 'State of the Union.' The power is
altogether conservative; it is to
protect a State, and not to destroy
it," to prevent the State from being
taken out of the Union, "not in any
contingency to put her out."

They refer to the decision of Judge Sprague
of Massachusetts, denying that the
suppressing of rebellion gave the
government the rights of conquest,
and to the decision of Judge Nel-
son, affirming that the reorganiza-
tion of the State government, after
the suppression of the rebellion,
"placed the State in the full enjoy-
ment, or entitled her to the full en-
joyment of all her constitutional
rights and privileges." They also
assert that there is nothing in "the
present political condition of the
States in question which justifies
their exclusion; that nobody can de-
ny the republican character of their
governments; and that for the Congress
"to convert an obligation of guaran-
tee into authority to interfere in any
way in the formation of the Govern-
ment to be guaranteed, is to do vio-
lence to language." Congress has
no power to form a Constitution for
a State; whether the State govern-
ments were legally established or
not, "is a matter with which Con-
gress has no concern." "The State
admitted, like the original thirteen
States, becomes at once and forever
independent of Congressional con-
trol." The framers of the Constitu-
tion "never intended to make the
State government subordinate to the
General Government." Whatever
change a State may make in her
government, Congress has no busi-
ness with them, unless they make
the State government anti-republican,
and then interference can take
place only under the obligation to
guarantee that it be republican.—
But instead of interfering in the in-
terest of republicanism, it is deny-
ing the States concerned that right,
which the Constitution properly ac-
cords as the security of all others;
"that right without which govern-
ment is anything but republican—
is indeed but a tyranny—the right
of having a voice in the Legislative
department, whose laws bind them
in person and property." This, it
is submitted, "is a state of things with-
out example in a representative re-
publican Government and Congress,
as long as it denies that right is a
mere despotism."

The proposed amendments are
improperly submitted. The States
should have the right of adopting
any of them, and of rejecting the
others. Some of them the Southern
States will, it is believed, cheerfully
approve; but "to force negro suffrage
upon any State by means of the
penalty of the loss of a part of its
representation, will not only be im-
posing a disparaging provision, but
is virtually to interfere with the
clear right of each State to regulate
suffrage for itself, without the con-
trol of the Government of the United
States." This measure, "in its
terms, and in its effect, whether de-
signed or not, is degrading to the
Southern States." It will have no
practical effect on the Northern
States, where the negroes are few in
number; but the Southern States
will be degraded as to their rank in
the Union if they refuse to adopt it,
and will be degraded alike in the
character of their voters and in sub-
mission to a humiliating proposition
if they accept it. The very "ine-
quality in the operation of the meas-
ure renders it most unjust, and,
looking to the peace and quiet of
the country, most impolitic."

The several amnesty proclama-
tions of Mr. Lincoln and his suc-
cessor, issued under the authority of
Congress, are inconsistent with the
idea that the parties included in
them are not to be held in the fu-
ture as restored to all rights belong-
ing to them as citizens. "It is now
settled that a pardon removes not
only the punishments, but all the
legal disability consequent on the
crimes." A different practice would
be a foul blot on the character of
the government.

The present state of the country
is not favorable for amending the
Constitution; and the conclusion is
that safety and expediency require
the admission of the Southern rep-
resentatives on the single condition
of subscribing to the oath required
by constitutional law—by which we
suppose is meant the ordinary oath
to support the Constitution.—Gal.
News.

Consents are now being made of
leather. This is doubtless in obedi-
ence to the poet's request:
"O Muse, of hideous hide of skins!"

All the local elections in southern
Illinois show Democratic gains of
from fifty to one hundred per cent.
over the last vote.

John Rots, the Cherokee chieftain
thirty years, is dead. He was old,
and, if we remember, was a gradu-
ate of Dartmouth. Two or three
of his sons and daughters were edu-
cated in New England, and were
likely people.

John Rots, the Cherokee chieftain
thirty years, is dead. He was old,
and, if we remember, was a gradu-
ate of Dartmouth. Two or three
of his sons and daughters were edu-
cated in New England, and were
likely people.

John Rots, the Cherokee chieftain
thirty years, is dead. He was old,
and, if we remember, was a gradu-
ate of Dartmouth. Two or three
of his sons and daughters were edu-
cated in New England, and were
likely people.

John Rots, the Cherokee chieftain
thirty years, is dead. He was old,
and, if we remember, was a gradu-
ate of Dartmouth. Two or three
of his sons and daughters were edu-
cated in New England, and were
likely people.

John Rots, the Cherokee chieftain
thirty years, is dead. He was old,
and, if we remember, was a gradu-
ate of Dartmouth. Two or three
of his sons and daughters were edu-
cated in New England, and were
likely people.

John Rots, the Cherokee chieftain
thirty years, is dead. He was old,
and, if we remember, was a gradu-
ate of Dartmouth. Two or three
of his sons and daughters were edu-
cated in New England, and were
likely people.

John Rots, the Cherokee chieftain
thirty years, is dead. He was old,
and, if we remember, was a gradu-
ate of Dartmouth. Two or three
of his sons and daughters were edu-
cated in New England, and were
likely people.

John Rots, the Cherokee chieftain
thirty years, is dead. He was old,
and, if we remember, was a gradu-
ate of Dartmouth. Two or three
of his sons and daughters were edu-
cated in New England, and were
likely people.

John Rots, the Cherokee chieftain
thirty years, is dead. He was old,
and, if we remember, was a gradu-
ate of Dartmouth. Two or three
of his sons and daughters were edu-
cated in New England, and were
likely people.

John Rots, the Cherokee chieftain
thirty years, is dead. He was old,
and, if we remember, was a gradu-
ate of Dartmouth. Two or three
of his sons and daughters were edu-
cated in New England, and were
likely people.

John Rots, the Cherokee chieftain
thirty years, is dead. He was old,
and, if we remember, was a gradu-
ate of Dartmouth. Two or three
of his sons and daughters were edu-
cated in New England, and were
likely people.

John Rots, the Cherokee chieftain
thirty years, is dead. He was old,
and, if we remember, was a gradu-
ate of Dartmouth. Two or three
of his sons and daughters were edu-
cated in New England, and were
likely people.

John Rots, the Cherokee chieftain
thirty years, is dead. He was old,
and, if we remember, was a gradu-
ate of Dartmouth. Two or three
of his sons and daughters were edu-
cated in New England, and were
likely people.

John Rots, the Cherokee chieftain
thirty years, is dead. He was old,
and, if we remember, was a gradu-
ate of Dartmouth. Two or three
of his sons and daughters were edu-
cated in New England, and were
likely people.

John Rots, the Cherokee chieftain
thirty years, is dead. He was old,
and, if we remember, was a gradu-
ate of Dartmouth. Two or three
of his sons and daughters were edu-
cated in New England, and were
likely people.

John Rots, the Cherokee chieftain
thirty years, is dead. He was old,
and, if we remember, was a gradu-
ate of Dartmouth. Two or three
of his sons and daughters were edu-
cated in New England, and were
likely people.

John Rots, the Cherokee chieftain
thirty years, is dead. He was old,
and, if we remember, was a gradu-
ate of Dartmouth. Two or three
of his sons and daughters were edu-
cated in New England, and were
likely people.

John Rots, the Cherokee chieftain
thirty years, is dead. He was old,
and, if we remember, was a gradu-
ate of Dartmouth. Two or three
of his sons and daughters were edu-
cated in New England, and were
likely people.

John Rots, the Cherokee chieftain
thirty years, is dead. He was old,
and, if we remember, was a gradu-
ate of Dartmouth. Two or three
of his sons and daughters were edu-
cated in New England, and were
likely people.

John Rots, the Cherokee chieftain
thirty years, is dead. He was old,
and, if we remember, was a gradu-
ate of Dartmouth. Two or three
of his sons and daughters were edu-
cated in New England, and were
likely people.

John Rots, the Cherokee chieftain
thirty years, is dead. He was old,
and, if we remember, was a gradu-
ate of Dartmouth. Two or three
of his sons and daughters were edu-
cated in New England, and were
likely people.

John Rots, the Cherokee chieftain
thirty years, is dead. He was old,
and, if we remember, was a gradu-
ate of Dartmouth. Two or three
of his sons and daughters were edu-
cated in New England, and were
likely people.

John Rots, the Cherokee chieftain
thirty years, is dead. He was old,
and, if we remember, was a gradu-
ate of Dartmouth. Two or three
of his sons and daughters were edu-
cated in New England, and were
likely people.

John Rots, the Cherokee chieftain
thirty years, is dead. He was old,
and, if we remember, was a gradu-
ate of Dartmouth. Two or three
of his sons and daughters were edu-
cated in New England, and were
likely people.

John Rots, the Cherokee chieftain
thirty years, is dead. He was old,
and, if we remember, was a gradu-
ate of Dartmouth. Two or three
of his sons and daughters were edu-
cated in New England, and were
likely people.

John Rots, the Cherokee chieftain
thirty years, is dead. He was old,
and, if we remember, was a gradu-
ate of Dartmouth. Two or three
of his sons and daughters were edu-
cated in New England, and were
likely people.

John Rots, the Cherokee chieftain
thirty years, is dead. He was old,
and, if we remember, was a gradu-
ate of Dartmouth. Two or three
of his sons and daughters were edu-
cated in New England, and were
likely people.

John Rots, the Cherokee chieftain
thirty years, is dead. He was old,
and, if we remember, was a gradu-
ate of Dartmouth. Two or three
of his sons and daughters were edu-
cated in New England, and were
likely people.

John Rots, the Cherokee chieftain
thirty years, is dead. He was old,
and, if we remember, was a gradu-
ate of Dartmouth. Two or three
of his sons and daughters were edu-
cated in New England, and were
likely people.

John Rots, the Cherokee chieftain
thirty years, is dead. He was old,
and, if we remember, was a gradu-
ate of Dartmouth. Two or three
of his sons and daughters were edu-
cated in New England, and were
likely people.

What is it About?

This is a question often asked in
reference to the present European
difficulty. We answer that the crown
of Denmark, which was elective
from the earliest times, became her-
editary in 1448 in the House of
Oldenburg, the first representative
of which was Christian I, who was
placed on the throne by the Danish
Diet, after the death of the last sei-
on of "the princely house of Skold."
The crown had been hereditary
one in a while for a short time be-
fore this period, but never long at a
time. It remained in the House of
Oldenburg, however, for about four
centuries. The direct male line of
that house became extinct at the
death of the sixteenth king, Freder-
ick VII., on the 15th November,
1863. In view of the probable death
of this king, without direct heirs,
the great powers of Europe, Eng-
land, France, Russia, Prussia, Aus-
tria, Sweden and Denmark, "taking
into consideration that the main-
tenance of the integrity of the Dan-
ish monarchy, as connected with the
general interests of the balance of
power in Europe, is of high impor-
tance to the preservation of peace,"
signed a treaty at London, May 8,
1865, by the terms of which the suc-
cession to the crown of Denmark
was made over to Prince Christian,
of Schleswig-Holstein-Sonderburg-
Glücksburg, to the exclusion of sev-
eral other collateral relations.—
Prince Christian succeeded to the
Danish throne November 15th, 1866.

The Duchies of Schleswig and
Holstein are governed by the old
Saxian law, excluding women from the
throne and, inasmuch as the male
line by which they were united to
Denmark in the fifteenth century
had become extinct with Frederick
VII., it was held by many that they
returned to the Duke of Augusten-
berg. The people of Holstein are
German, and were never well af-
fected towards the Danish rule.—
Being a member of the Germanic
Confederation, the States of which
are bound to assist each other, Hol-
stein applied to the German Diet for
relief from the Danish authority.
The people of Schleswig afterwards
made a similar request. The upshot
of the matter was that the German
Diet ignored the treaty of London,
and ordered the troops of the Con-
federation to oust Denmark and se-
cure the Duke of Augustenborg in
the possession of the two Duchies.

This was in March 1864, up to which
time Austria and Prussia, the lead-
ing powers of the Confederation,
had remained quiet. Now, however,
they claimed the privilege, as the
greater powers, of doing the fight-
ing. Prussia took the lead and Aus-
tria co-operated. Denmark called
on England for aid, in view, we sup-
pose, of the treaty of 1862, and also
on the ground of a treaty offensive
and defensive entered into between
the two countries at the time of the
marriage of the Prince of Wales
with Alexandra, daughter of the
reigning King of Denmark, whom
Great Britain had helped to place
on the throne. Lord John Russell
threatened vengeance if Denmark
should be attacked, and called a con-
ference of powers, which Prussia
refused to attend. The conference
ended in smoke, and Prussia, sus-
tained by Austria, forced Denmark
to yield not only Schleswig and Hol-
stein but Lauenburg also to her de-
mands. At Vienna, in the month
of August, 1864, the plenipotenti-
aries of Denmark, Austria and Prus-
sia signed an agreement, in the first
paragraph of which "His Majesty
the King of Denmark renounces all
his rights to the Duchies of Schles-
wig, Holstein and Lauenburg in fa-
vor of their Majesties the King of
Prussia and the Emperor of Austria,
engaging to recognize the arrange-
ments their said Majesties shall
make in respect of those Duchies."

Those arrangements were the pur-
chase by Prussia of the Austrian in-
terest in Lauenburg for two millions
of dollars, and a joint proprietor-
ship of Schleswig-Holstein, which
led to a quarrel and to a treaty
concluding by not only Schleswig and
Holstein but Lauenburg also to her de-
mands. At Vienna, in the month
of August, 1864, the plenipotenti-
aries of Denmark, Austria and Prus-
sia signed an agreement, in the first
paragraph of which "His Majesty
the King of Denmark renounces all
his rights to the Duchies of Schles-
wig, Holstein and Lauenburg in fa-
vor of their Majesties the King of
Prussia and the Emperor of Austria,
engaging to recognize the arrange-
ments their said Majesties shall
make in respect of those Duchies."

Those arrangements were the pur-
chase by Prussia of the Austrian in-
terest in Lauenburg for two millions
of dollars, and a joint proprietor-
ship of Schleswig-Holstein, which
led to a quarrel and to a treaty
concluding by not only Schleswig and
Holstein but Lauenburg also to her de-
mands. At Vienna, in the month
of August, 1864, the plenipotenti-
aries of Denmark, Austria and Prus-
sia signed an agreement, in the first
paragraph of which "His Majesty
the King of Denmark renounces all
his rights to the Duchies of Schles-
wig, Holstein and Lauenburg in fa-
vor of their Majesties the King of
Prussia and the Emperor of Austria,
engaging to recognize the arrange-
ments their said Majesties shall
make in respect of those Duchies."

Those arrangements were the pur-
chase by Prussia of the Austrian in-
terest in Lauenburg for two millions
of dollars, and a joint proprietor-
ship of Schleswig-Holstein, which
led to a quarrel and to a treaty
concluding by not only Schleswig and
Holstein but Lauenburg also to her de-
mands. At Vienna, in the month
of August, 1864, the plenipotenti-
aries of Denmark, Austria and Prus-
sia signed an agreement, in the first
paragraph of which "His Majesty
the King of Denmark renounces all
his rights to the Duchies of Schles-
wig, Holstein and Lauenburg in fa-
vor of their Majesties the King of
Prussia and the Emperor of Austria,
engaging to recognize the arrange-
ments their said Majesties shall
make in respect of those Duchies."

Those arrangements were the pur-
chase by Prussia of the Austrian in-
terest in Lauenburg for two millions
of dollars, and a joint proprietor-
ship of Schleswig-Holstein, which
led to a quarrel and to a treaty
concluding by not only Schleswig and
Holstein but Lauenburg also to her de-
mands. At Vienna, in the month
of August, 1864, the plenipotenti-
aries of Denmark, Austria and Prus-
sia signed an agreement, in the first
paragraph of which "His Majesty
the King of Denmark renounces all
his rights to the Duchies of Schles-
wig, Holstein and Lauenburg in fa-
vor of their Majesties the King of
Prussia and the Emperor of Austria,
engaging to recognize the arrange-
ments their said Majesties shall
make in respect of those Duchies."

Those arrangements were the pur-
chase by Prussia of the Austrian in-
terest in Lauenburg for two millions
of dollars, and a joint proprietor-
ship of Schleswig-Holstein, which
led to a quarrel and to a treaty
concluding by not only Schleswig and
Holstein but Lauenburg also to her de-
mands. At Vienna, in the month
of August, 1864, the plenipotenti-
aries of Denmark, Austria and Prus-
sia signed an agreement, in the first
paragraph of which "His Majesty
the King of Denmark renounces all
his rights to the Duchies of Schles-
wig, Holstein and Lauenburg in fa-
vor of their Majesties the King of
Prussia and the Emperor of Austria,
engaging to recognize the arrange-
ments their said Majesties shall
make in respect of those Duchies."

Those arrangements were the pur-
chase by Prussia of the Austrian in-
terest in Lauenburg for two millions
of dollars, and a joint proprietor-
ship of Schleswig-Holstein, which
led to a quarrel and to a treaty
concluding by not only Schleswig and
Holstein but Lauenburg also to her de-
mands. At Vienna, in the month
of August, 1864, the plenipotenti-
aries of Denmark, Austria and Prus-
sia signed an agreement, in the first
paragraph of which "His Majesty
the King of Denmark renounces all
his rights to the Duchies of Schles-
wig, Holstein and Lauenburg in fa-
vor of their Majesties the King of
Prussia and the Emperor of Austria,
engaging to recognize the arrange-
ments their said Majesties shall
make in respect of those Duchies."

Those arrangements were the pur-
chase by Prussia of the Austrian in-
terest in Lauenburg for two millions
of dollars, and a joint proprietor-
ship of Schleswig-Holstein, which
led to a quarrel and to a treaty
concluding by not only Schleswig and
Holstein but Lauenburg also to her de-
mands. At Vienna, in the month
of August, 1864, the plenipotenti-
aries of Denmark, Austria and Prus-
sia signed an agreement, in the first
paragraph of which "His Majesty
the King of Denmark renounces all
his rights to the Duchies of Schles-
wig, Holstein and Lauenburg in fa-
vor of their Majesties the King of
Prussia and the Emperor of Austria,
engaging to recognize the arrange-
ments their said Majesties shall
make in respect of those Duchies."

Those arrangements were the pur-
chase by Prussia of the Austrian in-
terest in Lauenburg for two millions
of dollars, and a joint proprietor-
ship of Schleswig-Holstein, which
led to a quarrel and to a treaty
concluding by not only Schleswig and
Holstein but Lauenburg also to her de-
mands. At Vienna, in the month
of August, 1864, the plenipotenti-
aries of Denmark, Austria and Prus-
sia signed an agreement, in the first
paragraph of which "His Majesty
the King of Denmark renounces all
his rights to the Duchies of Schles-
wig, Holstein and Lauenburg in fa-
vor of their Majesties the King of
Prussia and the Emperor of Austria,
engaging to recognize the arrange-
ments their said Majesties shall
make in respect of those Duchies."

Those arrangements were the pur-
chase by Prussia of the Austrian in-
terest in Lauenburg for two millions
of dollars, and a joint proprietor-
ship of Schleswig-Holstein, which
led to a quarrel and to a treaty
concluding by not only Schleswig and
Holstein but Lauenburg also to her de-
mands. At Vienna, in the month
of August, 1864, the plenipotenti-
aries of Denmark, Austria and Prus-
sia signed an agreement, in the first
paragraph of which "His Majesty
the King of Denmark renounces all
his rights to the Duchies of Schles-
wig, Holstein and Lauenburg in fa-
vor of their Majesties the King of
Prussia and